

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9-18, and 22-28 are pending in this application. Claim 19 is canceled by the present response without prejudice and new claims 25-28 are added by the present response. Claims 8, 20, and 21 were previously canceled.

Claims 1-4, 6, 10-14, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,946,032 to Ishizuka et al. (herein "Ishizuka") in view of JP 07-264463 to Tomitaka. Claims 5, 7, 9, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishizuka in view of Tomitaka and further in view of U.S. patent 5,331,365 to Miyazawa et al. (herein "Miyazawa"). Claim 19 was objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was noted as allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants gratefully acknowledge that indication of the allowable subject matter.

Addressing now the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Each of independent claims 1 and 15 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now recites a shaking detector configured to detect a shaking of the camera based upon an output from "at least a pair of acceleration sensors". Further, the claimed "calculator" is configured to calculate a rotation angle of each of the coordinate axes based on the output of the "pair of acceleration sensors". Independent claim 13 is amended to recite similar features.

The above-noted claim features are believed to be fully supported by the original specification, for example at page 10, lines 8-9, the use of pair of acceleration sensors Y1, Y2 is disclosed, and see also for example Figure 4(a), Figure 6(a), Figure 7, and Figures 13(a) and 13(b).

The above-noted features are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

The outstanding rejection cites Ishizuka utilizing angular velocity sensors 1 and 10. However, Ishizuka does not disclose the use of the claimed “at least a pair of acceleration sensors” now recited in each of amended independent claims 1 and 13.

Further, neither of the other additional cited art to Tomitaka nor Miyazawa were cited to disclose such features, and applicants respectfully submit the teachings in Tomitaka and Miyazawa do not overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Ishizuka.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit each of amended independent claims 1 and 13, and the claims dependent therefrom, distinguish over the applied art.

The present response also sets forth new dependent claims 25-28 for examination, which are fully supported by the original specification. For example, new dependent claims 25 and 27 are supported at page 16, lines 15-16 and Figure 13(a) and new claims 26 and 28 are supported at page 16, lines 16-18 and Figure 13(b). New dependent claims 25-28 are also believed to be allowable as they depend from one of allowable claims 1 and 13, and those claims are also believed to recite additional features distinguishing over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

GJM:SNS\la

I:\ATTY\SNS\0557\05574757\05574757US-AM DUE 121004.DOC